UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/595,526 | 04/26/2006 | Leah M. P. Pastel | BUR920030080US1 | 2272 |
| 32074 7590 06/20/2008 INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION DEPT. 18G BLDG. 300-482 2070 ROUTE 52 HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | VELEZ, ROBERTO | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2829 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/20/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|---|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Office Action Comment | 10/595,526 | PASTEL, LEAH M. P. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Roberto Velez | 2829 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 A</u> | oril 2006 | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | · | | | | |
| | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 455 C.G. 215. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-25 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | te | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other: | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/595,526 Page 2

Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

2. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which

are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

3. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to

elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

A) Group I, claim(s) 1-8, drawn to a hot-switchable voltage bus for IDDQ

measurement.

B) Group II, claim(s) 9-25, drawn to a method for IDDQ testing or monitoring

power consumption.

4. The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive

concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or

corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The product of group

I as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. For

example, the product can be used to selectively connect each voltage island to the

quiescent and global voltage busses during IDDQ testing, which is not required in the

method of group II.

5. If group II is elected, a further restriction is required as follows.

C) Group III, claim(s) 9-24, drawn to a hot-switchable voltage bus for IDDQ

measurement.

D) Group IV, claim(s) 25, drawn to a method for monitoring power consumption.

Art Unit: 2829

6. The inventions listed as Groups III and IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The inventions as claimed can have a materially different mode of operation and function. The invention of group III deals with performing IDDQ testing on the at least one voltage island and the invention of group IV deals with monitoring power usage at a VDDq power supply connected to the guiescent voltage bus for at least one voltage island. Therefore, the inventions as claimed can have a materially different mode of operation and function

Page 3

- 7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.
- 8. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.
- 9. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Application/Control Number: 10/595,526

Art Unit: 2829

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of

an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

10. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product

claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process

claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to

be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product

are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product

claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP

§ 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the

above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during

prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double

patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement

is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Roberto Velez whose telephone number is 571-272-

8597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am- 4:30 pm.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/595,526 Page 5

Art Unit: 2829

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roberto Velez/

Examiner, Art Unit 2829

06/12/2008

/Ha T. Nguyen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2829